



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,623	01/22/2001	Hiroyuki Kaneko	1095.1152/JDH	8796

21171 7590 12/21/2006
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/21/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/765,623

Applicant(s)

KANEKO, HIROYUKI

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 10/19/2006. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claim 7 has been added as a new claim. Claims 1-7 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

4. Claims 1 and 6-7 recite the newly amended limitation *"providing, when a request, specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment*

Art Unit: 2141

corresponding to the received user ID and password", which was not described in Fig. 9 and the corresponding specification (page 14, line 27 – page 16, line 8) in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Examiner respectfully submits that at step [S5] of Fig. 9, after the CPU determines that the user has already logged in to the server then the CPU proceeds to step [S9] wherein the CPU performs an appropriate process corresponding to a request sent from the user. Both of the Fig. 9 and the corresponding specification (page 14, line 27 – page 16, line 8) do not appear to describe and/or support the newly amended limitation sufficiently. Hence, Examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to exactly point out the portion of the specification (with the pages and line numbers) and/or the drawings (with the steps) that supports the newly amended limitation as claimed in claims 1 and 6-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosawa et al. (US 6,047,288), hereinafter "Kurosawa", in view of Cox et al. (US 6,510,466), hereinafter "Cox".

7. As to claim 1, Kurosawa teaches a system and method of group environment specifying and setting, comprising:

group specifying means for specifying, in the case of a predetermined user having logged in using a user ID and password, a group to which the user belongs (*group list 601a stores a group name and members of the group*) (Kurosawa, Fig. 20, col. 12, lines 30-34 and col. 24, lines 35-42);

using environment specifying means for specifying a using environment corresponding to the group specified by the group specifying means (*the environment setting information of a designated group is derived from the database*) (Kurosawa, col. 13, lines 35-54);

using environment setting means for setting an environment which conforms to the using environment specified by the using environment specifying means (*the environment setting information is derived and sent to the terminal to apply the environment setting*) (Kurosawa, col. 14, line 55 – col. 15, line 16); and

creating databases (*databases 601a and 601b as illustrated in Figs. 20-21*) according to group and designating one of the databases, which an application program uses (*the setting information in database 601b of Fig. 21 gives a default setting for a conferencing application*) (Kurosawa, Figs. 20-21, col. 24, line 35 – col. 25, line 13).

However, **Kurosawa** does not explicitly teach providing, when a request specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in, the received request to the specified application program according to the group and the using environment corresponding to the received user ID and password.

In an analogous art, **Cox** teaches a system and method for centralized management of application programs on a network, wherein an administrator may define and authorized certain users and/or groups of users to access appropriate applications installed on the server in the database 208, which acts as a central repository of application management information, such as user, software, device preference and access control information, responsive to client management server 204 (**Cox, col. 8, line 57 – col. 9, line 5**). **Cox** also teaches in Fig. 4, if a user identification and password information is contained in the request at block 234, user login operations are executed including bringing up a user desktop and establishing the user's credentials and application access authorization (**Cox, col. 12, lines 53-57**), and if it is determined that the request has been received from an already logged-in user at block 238 requesting execution of an application (as opposed to initial setup of a user desktop interface in the first time log-in), application access management operations are executed to bring up an instance of the managed/requested application for the user at block 240 (*i.e., after determining that the user has logged in, performing an appropriate process corresponding to a request sent from the user*) (**Cox, col. 12, line 61-67**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of **Kurosawa** with the teachings of **Cox** to include providing the received request to the specified application program according to the user ID and password included in a packet of the request to establish the user's credentials and application access authorization (**Cox, col. 12, lines 53-57**). One would be motivated to do so to allow the system to provide login support for user authentication and mapping to a user profile and software support to configure the software (*applets and applications*) users and groups for access to and the user preferences for those software applications (**Cox, col. 10, lines 38-43**).

8. As to claim 2, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the group comprises one or more users (**Kurosawa, Fig. 20**).

9. As to claim 3, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the databases are divided physically or logically according to the groups (*databases 601a as illustrated in Fig. 20*), and the using environment setting means sets one of the databases corresponding to the group specified by the group specifying means (*the setting information in database 601b of Fig. 21 gives a default setting for a conferencing application*) (**Kurosawa, Figs. 20-21, col. 24, line 35 – col. 25, line 13**).

10. As to claim 4, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the group specifying means comprises a table which associates user information regarding each

Art Unit: 2141

user with the group to which each user belongs (*for example, as illustrated in Fig. 20, USER1 belongs to group 3/C, USER2 and USER3 belong to group 2/B, etc.*) and specifies the appropriate group by referring to the user information, which user entered when the user logged in, and the table (**Kurosawa, Fig. 20, col. 24, lines 35-42**).

11. As to claim 5, **Kurosawa-Cox** teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising processing means for performing a process corresponding to a request from the user (*the environment setting information is derived and sent to the terminal to apply the environment setting*) (**Kurosawa, col. 14, line 55 – col. 15, line 16**), wherein the processing means performs a process in the environment for each group set by the using environment setting means (*for example, icon displays may be selected for inclusion in the desktop based on whether a particular user is an authorized user for the associated applications*) (**Cox, col. 9, line 58 – col. 10, line 2**).

12. Claim 6 is a corresponding computer-readable record medium claim of system claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

13. Claim 7 recites a method claim that contains similar limitations as system claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

14. In the Remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(A) Prior Art does not teach or suggest *“a request specifying a particular application program, is received from the logged-in user, along with both the user ID and password used by that user to log in”*, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6-7.

As to point (A), **Cox** teaches in Fig. 4 at block 234, if a user identification and password information is contained in the request, user login operations are executed including bringing up a user desktop and establishing the user's credentials and application access authorization (**Cox, col. 12, lines 53-57**), and if it is determined that the request has been received from an already logged-in user at block 238 requesting execution of an application (as opposed to initial setup of a user desktop interface if it is the first time log-in for the user), application access management operations are executed to bring up an instance of the managed/requested application for the user at block 240 (*i.e., after determining that the user has logged in, performing an appropriate process corresponding to a request sent from the user*) (**Cox, col. 12, line 61-67**).

Hence, every request from the user is supposed to be accompanied by the user identification and password information, regardless of whether the user has already logged in to the server system 22.

Art Unit: 2141

15. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 10/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2141

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Quang N. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
AU – 2141



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER